DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 912 EA 011 673

AUTHOR Schwartz, Henrietta S.; Schwartz, Bernard S.
TITLE The Development of an Interagency Agreement: The Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy School Crime Intervention Program.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979) ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Agencies; *Delinquency; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Interagency Cooperation; *Interagency Coordination; Organizational Theories; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS Federal Agencies; Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; Office of Education; School Crime Intervention Program; Teacher Corps; Youth Advocacy Project

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to document the development, operation, and impact of an interagency agreement between two federal departments cooperating to create the School Crime Intervention Program, Activity I. The agencies involved were the U.S. Office of Education and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Data were collected through interviews with key informants in the agencies and project directors, examinations of files, and nonparticipant observation of program-related events. Organizational theories and anthropological models were used to analyze the largely ethnographic data. Findings indicate that both agencies had common broad social goals in working with troubled youth. Necessary elements in collaboration referred to as the "transactional model" facilitated the program design and operation of the agreement. These included field-based readiness for the program, power and authority of the chief administrators, a transactional style of organizational management, frequent contacts between the key actors, and power and viability of the Student Initiated Activities Model. A number of other specific findings and recommendations resulted from the study. Recommendations included the formation of an interagency committee, encouragement of replications of the program, and clearer definition of the project director's role. Researchers concluded that the success of the interagency agreement was documented. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170912

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Development of An Interagency Agreement:

The Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy

School Crime Intervention Program

by

Professors
Henrietta S. Schwartz
and
Bernard S. Schwartz

Research and Development Center
College of Education
Roosevelt University
Chicago, Illinois

April, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. Schwartz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979. No portion of this paper may be cited without the permission of the authors.

SESSION #24.28

EA 011 673

ABSTRACT

The Development of an Interagency Agreement Between the U. S. Office of Education and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration: The School Crime Intervention Program of Youth Advocacy Projects

HENRIETTA SCHWARTZ, Roosevelt University
BERNARD SCHWARTZ, Roosevelt University

The purpose of this investigation was to document the development, operation, and impact of an interagency agreement between two federal departments cooperating to create a School Crime Intervention Program. The study used a variety of organizational theories and anthropological models to analyze the largely ethnographic data collected from the files of the federal agencies and interviews with key actors at the federal and local levels. The findings and recommendations presented to the decision-makers in the agencies will be incorporated into policies and practices at the national and local levels.

The development of cooperative programs between agencies of the federal government, though relatively rare, has been viewed by Congress and the President of the United States as a desirable direction for potentially more effective use of scarce resources and for speedier effectuation and attainment of national goals. This paper will examine a successful model of such a federal agency agreement, and through the approach of organizational theory and anthropological inquiry -- an ethnographic approach -- delineate the patterns which emerged, the implications for other such agreements, and the potential for broader and more frequent replication in the area of education.

In response to attention by Congress and widespread public concern regarding juvenile crime, Public Law 93-415 was passed by the 93rd Congress and was supported by the 94th Congress and approved by two Presidents.[1] The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 provided a basis for a national attack on the problems of youth and supplied the focus and funding for the interagency agreement between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Teacher Corps Program, and the Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The interagency agreement created the School Crime Intervention component named Activity II of the Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Programs, called Activity I.[2] The purpose of the program was to reduce crime and violence and the climate of fear accompanying these disruptions in public schools in ten sites across the country through the intervention strategy of Student Initiated Activities (SIA).

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention/Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (OJJDP/LEAA) advanced the idea that Student Initiated Activities (SIA) would bring about subcultures in schools among students in which

---

[1]Bayh, Birch. "Seeking Solutions to School Violence," The Kappan, Vol. 59, No. 5, January, 1978, p. 299.

[2]Activity I, "Youth Advocacy Projects focus on strengthening the educational opportunities available to troubled youths, who are currently ignored or 'pushed out' by the public school system", Clarence C. Walker, "Youth Advocacy Programs in Teacher Corps, Fact Sheet." Teacher Corps brochure, Washington, D.C. 1978.

students felt a sense of ownership and belonging. The OJJDP/LEAA also suggested that teachers and administrators in schools should share with the students in the planning and implementation of the school program, on the assumption that crime and disruption would diminish if students took part in decision making.

Interagency agreements at the federal level are rare for a variety of reasons: the varying missions of governmental agencies, the different procedures employed by each agency, mismatched time lines, differing legislation for funding, "turf" problems, and non-parallel agency structures and styles. Therefore, when such an agreement is concluded and translated into ten operational field-based projects in all parts of the country, the agreement and attendant program should be investigated for replicable elements.

I. Assumptions

The assumption was that the uniqueness of the effort merited full documentation. This investigation strictly speaking was not an evaluation, nor was it concerned with the level of "successful" operation of the individual projects in the field, except as key informants perceived their impact on the program culture. The investigation should be viewed as a descriptive and analytical picture of the origin, development and operation of the School Crime Intervention Program, herein after referred to as Activity II of the Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Program.

II. Conceptual Frameworks

The Activity II program was viewed as a subculture[1] within the larger framework of the Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Program (YAP). A subculture may develop when individuals work toward common goals. Three constructs of the origins of a subculture were used to view the development and nature of this interagency agreement which came to be known as Activity II. They were:

---

[1]A subculture refers to a distinct group of individuals who share the common elements of the mainstream culture, but also possess a unique set of behaviors and visible identity within the framework of the broader culture.

1. Complementarity of needs between two agencies at the federal level.
2. The necessary elements in collaboration, which are described as a transactional model involving parity among agencies, roles at the interface of the cooperating groups, and negotiation as a program process.
3. Changes in individual and group behavior in response to the mutual adaptation of one culture by another, the adaptation of the Teacher Corps culture to that of the OJJDP/LEAA and vice versa to create a program.

A. Complementarity of Needs

In preliminary discussions with program officials concerning the scope of work involved in the study, it became evident that both agencies, had, not similar, but complementary needs in the summer of 1976. Further discussions and an examination of the files reinforced this assumption and functioned as a useful way of describing and explaining the speed with which the two agencies were able to accomplish the contract negotiations at the federal and local levels. It is the assumption of this investigation that joint agreements which lead to functional field based projects begin with complementary needs in the following areas:

1. There is a congruence of underlying motives among the agencies, for example, social service, economic regulation, child welfare, etc.
2. There is sufficient proximity to permit ongoing interactions between principle actors in the concerned agencies at the federal and local level, e.g., opportunity for face-to-face contact between decision makers.
3. If the agreement requires a field based component, there is a level of readiness in the field which provides fertile ground for the creation of operational projects.
4. The concerned agencies have parallel time lines in funding, program operation, and enabling legislation.
5. At the time of negotiation, there is an availability of fiscal, material, and human resources in those agencies directly related to establishing the agreement.

6. There are persistent and committed advocates for the interagency agreement in both agencies.

It will be seen when the data are presented that most if not all of the conditions concerning complementary needs stated above are characteristic of the two agencies involved in the Activity II interagency agreement.

B. Characteristics of Collaboration in Transactional Organizations

Any organization can make choices about the style of administration that will govern the interaction of people and roles within the organization. It is the contention of this investigation that Teacher Corps exemplifies a transactional style of interaction. Its success as a federal program over the last several years illustrates the value of such a style. The term transactional comes from the socio-cultural model of social behavior in organizations outlined by Getzels and Guba.[1] A diagram of the model is shown in Appendix C.

The transactional model assumes that each program is a unique social system characterized by institutional role sets (i.e., teacher-student, doctor-patient, lawyer-client) and expectations, and filled by persons with individual needs. The three styles of leadership-followership which the theory defines are nomothetic, ideographic, and transactional. The nomothetic style emphasizes adherence to role expectations and the requirements of the institution: an assembly line or a prison are examples. The ideographic style emphasizes the need dispositions of the individuals: a research and development center in industry is a good example. The transactional style emphasizes the interaction of the two, i.e., the institution and the individuals. The literature prepared by the Teacher Corps program and the articles written by its director clearly state a preference for the transactional style of organizational management, particularly in the requirement for collaborative arrangements in program management at the local and national level.

Teacher Corps further fits the conditions usually found in organizations which

[1] J.W. Getzels, F.F. Campbell, J.M. Lipham, Educational Administration as a Social Process, Theory, Research, Practice (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).

adopt a transactional style. First, it is a low power organization requiring the cooperation of universities, communities, and school districts at the local level to function effectively. Second, the Teacher Corps programs tend to be new and experimental to the participants and require constant input of data from research and evaluation to self-correct operations. Third, the collaborative model of maximum participation in the decision making process is seen as a valued end in itself in addition to the assumption that wide participation ensures ownership and commitment to program goals. Given these conditions, it seems appropriate and useful to look at the Activity II component of the Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Projects as displaying the three characteristics of a collaborative transactional organization.

In terms of the structure of the arrangement, one would expect to find parity among the agencies involved in the agreement, specifically, Teacher Corps and OJJDP/LEAA. That is, there would be joint decision making and much consultation among the agencies regarding the nature of the program, the thrust of the field based activities, the fiscal management, monitoring, etc. Second, if parity is a key term in structure, interface is a key term in role definition. One would expect to find a series of roles at the federal and local level which function as liaisons between the agencies and the program components. The task of persons in these roles is to interpret the program to the involved people, gain their understanding, sympathy, support, and assistance to accomplish the administrative work necessary to make the relationship among the agencies functional and smooth. Finally, if parity is a key term in structure, and interface a key to role definition, then negotiation is a key term for program process. That is, one would expect conflicts, tensions, misunderstandings, and differences would be resolved, not by administrative dictates or confrontations, but by negotiation and mutual accountability.

Teacher Corps was the agency charged with carrying out the activities of the interagency agreement. In one way or another, the history of Teacher Corps and Youth Advocacy Projects exemplified the three characteristics of a collaborative transactional organization. Many of its structures are based on the concept of parity, many roles

are defined as interfaces between groups and the prevailing process is negotiation. How well the other agency, OJJDP/LEAA, fits this model will be discussed in the results section of the report.

C. The Creation of a Program Subculture - Cultural Universals Model

Two program cultures, Teacher Corps and OJJDP/LEAA, came into contact for the purpose of establishing a new set of field based projects called Activity II, the School Crime Intervention Program. Both agencies had established operating procedures, formal and informal norms and other institutional trappings familiar to the participants in each organization. Further, the Youth Advocacy Projects of Teacher Corps had evolved its own set of unique procedures within the Teacher Corps culture to meet the needs of the special clients the YAP projects served. Activity II brought these separate lifeways into contact in 1976. There was some culture conflict, some assimilation, some selective adaptation, and some rejection.

The framework through which these events will be viewed is borrowed from the anthropologist.[1] A description of the cultural universals framework follows. Federal agencies (Teacher Corps, Office of Education, OJJDP/LEAA) and the set of 10 local YAP projects are viewed as cultures, or unique systems of human behavior related to the goals of each agency. These agency cultures had purpose, pattern, and coherence and responded in different ways to contact with the culture of the other agency. The point is that the interagency agreement did create an identifiable subculture within the Teacher Corps mainstream called Activity II with its own values about what ought to be the best ways of doing things and what is good and what is bad. The value system and seven other identifiable patterns of behavior and belief are called cultural universals or universal patterns of behavior. They represent those universal aspects of human behavior which each culture or subculture must display if group living is to occur. In addition to a values system, each agency culture must have a cosmology or world view which specifies what constitutes reality. Each cultural unit has some form of social

[1] "The School and the Classroom as Cultural Systems," in Martin Jason & Henrietta Schwartz, A Guidebook to Action Research for the Occupational Educator, DAVTE, Illinois Office of Education, 1976. pp. 135-143.

organization which governs individual and group relationship events to the point of determining titles and forms of verbal address. Each system has a technology, a body of knowledge and skills used to perform the tasks necessary for the system to function and survive. There is an economic system which regulates the allocation of goods and services in the agency or project. Further, there is a form of governance or a political system regulating individual and institutional behavior which specifies how decisions are made, how power, authority, and influence are acquired and used, and who participates in what decisions. Typically, there is a special language uniquely suited to the goals of the agency. Finally, there is a socialization process or educational process which regularizes the transmission of knowledge to the neophytes, the unlearned ones in the group. It should be emphasized that the cultural universals model is only one of many conceptual frameworks which anthropologists use to look at the world. It is used here to attempt to capture the development of the subculture related to Activity II programs.

III. Methodology and Limitations of the Study

Data collection and analysis began at the end of February, 1978, and concluded in mid-May, 1978, approximately three months later. The methodology used to collect and analyze information concerning the development and nature of the Teacher Corps and OJJDP/LEAA interagency agreement combines aspects of historical research and anthropological field methods. Four primary sources were used to collect information:

1. Interview with key informants, at the federal and external agencies involved: Teacher Corps and OJJDP/LEAA and Social Action Research Consultants, the external evaluator.
2. Examination of the files in Teacher Corps, Washington, and some file material provided by OJJDP/LEAA personnel.
3. Interviews with the project directors of the 10 Youth Advocacy Projects involved in Activity II programs. Interviews with the Associate Directors* involved in the 10 Activity II projects
4. Nonparticipant observation of Activity II related events.

*In one case, a Program Development Specialist rather than an Associate Director was interviewed.

Content analysis was the primary technique used to derive patterns from the written material and a thematic content analysis was used to analyze nonparticipant observation notes. Four interview schedules were developed for each role group represented among the key informant group: one for those involved at the federal level in Teacher and OJJDP/LEAA, a schedule for the external evaluation firm, Social Action Research Center, a schedule for the Project Directors, and a schedule for the Associate Directors in charge of the Activity II components of the YAP programs. In addition, informal conversations were held with other persons identified as being closely related to the development of the agreement, a former YAP Project Director, the executive secretary of the Loop (the network organization for the 10 projects), a fiscal officer from the Office of the Budget, the fiscal officer for Teacher Corps, an LEAA consultant and others identified in the list of those interviewed presented in the Appendix.

A variety of journal articles about the YAP of Teacher Corps and other material concerning the mission of OJJDP/LEAA were read and a selected list of the documents and files examined are shown in Appendix A. While all of the documents which were read (approximately 1000 separate items) were not content analyzed, they did provide part of the background information the investigators used to make sense of the data being codified.

Demographic information concerning the Directors and Associate Directors was obtained from observations and interviews and is presented for a specific purpose of drawing contrasts between the two groups. Finally, the judgment of the investigators functioned as the final filter through which the data were sifted and reported.

Given the limited time available to the investigators for the gathering and examination of data and the fact that visits to the ten projects could not be made, it is possible some aspects of the development of the interagency agreement have been overlooked. For example, the investigators were not present at any of the meetings of the

Loop[1] where many of the concerns related to the Activity II components of the program were negotiated. The principal investigator was present at the meetings of the Associate Directors in November, 1977 and March, 1978, and it may be that their concerns have been overemphasized, for they were observed first hand. Additionally, there was simply no time for the in-depth five or six hour repeated interviews with key informants in the field and at the national level, nor was there an opportunity to examine the files of OJJDP/LEAA with the same intensity used to examine Teacher Corps files in Washington.

The language of the report may seem highly personalized to those unfamiliar with anthropological literature, particularly with ethnographic descriptions of cultures. Real names of real people are used in this document for three reasons: historical, literary, and anthropological. First, it is a historical document and the unique contributions made by key actors are a function of individual personalities interacting with each other and institutional expectations. To disguise the actors would tend to lead the reader to play guessing games to no avail, for the identity of the role incumbents is a matter of public record in most cases. Second, to refer to each individual by role title rather than name, each time the report required mentioning the behavior of the role incumbent, would lead to extremely cumbersome prose. For example, a simple declarative sentence on page 30 which uses the names of those involved would become, "In a letter of January 25, 1977 from the Director of Special Emphasis Projects, OJJDP/LEAA to the Director of Teacher Corps, a copy of which was sent to the Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Program Coordinator, Washington, the following appears." Third, once complex role relationships and structural arrangements are described, the reporting tradition in anthropological literature is to use names. It is in this tradition that the report has been framed and written. Finally, the investigators' own biases and limitations must be taken into account as one reads the findings presented in the next section.

---

[1]The Loop is the network organization for the 10 Youth Advocacy Projects. Its purpose is to promote communication, cooperation, and sharing among Projects. The Board of Directors consists of each Project Director. A full time executive secretary implements Loop policy.

IV. The Findings

The complete presentation and discussion of findings can be examined in Federal Report # LEAA - J - IAA-030-6 commissioned by the U.S. Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, The Development of an Interagency Agreement: The Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy School Crime Intervention Program, 1978.

The findings of the investigation are presented in three ways. First, a summary chronology of critical events is shown. The data for the chronology were drawn from an analysis of agency file documents and interviews with those persons most directly involved in orchestrating the interagency agreement.

Second, the thrust of the interagency agreement is examined and the fiscal arrangements at the federal level are summarized. The patterns which emerged from the analysis of the documents and observation notes is commented on in terms of the issues and themes represented in the program. For example, a careful examination of the working drafts of the interagency agreement reveals the language of the documents is related more closely to that of the OJJDP/LEAA legislation than to the language of the Teacher Corps documents. In the analysis of the nonparticipant observation notes taken at Youth Advocacy Conferences attended by the investigators in November of 1977 and March of 1978 and at the Washington offices of Teacher Corps and LEAA, patterns of superior, subordinate relationships emerged which distinguished the varying styles of the two agencies.

Third, a summary of responses to interview schedules is presented by role group. (In the full report these data are presented in tabular form.) The categories were derived from a thematic analysis of responses. From these data and the historical and observation information, a description of the aspects of the Activity II subculture is presented.

The summary information which follows is an abstract of the more than 60 pages of detailed findings presented in the full report.

A. Complementarity

With regard to the construct of complementarity, both agencies had common broad social goals in the area of working either directly or indirectly with troubled youth. Both agencies had the charge to develop and demonstrate new models of implementing institutional change and of making some impact on the nation's schools. Teacher Corps had a longer history of working in schools with administrators and teachers, but could not use its funds for direct service to students. The OJJDP/LEAA could use funds for direct service to students, but as a new agency, had a limited history of working with public schools.

B. Transactional Model

The necessary elements in collaboration described in the theoretical framework and referred to as the transactional model facilitated the program design and operation of the agreement. These were:

1. Field-based readiness - There was a level of readiness to engage in a program like Activity II on the part of several of the Youth Advocacy Project Directors as a result of previous experience and communication on the subject of delinquency.
2. Power and authority of chief administrators in the two agencies - William L. Smith, Director of Teacher Corps, and Emily Martin, Director of Special Emphasis Projects of OJJDP/LEAA, had the authority and responsibility to respond quickly to crucial issues in the program and negotiate them.
3. The use of the transactional style of organizational management which allowed the accommodation of different styles of agency operation, negotiation of conflict, communication at all levels of the organizations and with the field, and operation on the basis of parity between the two agencies.

4. Frequent contacts between the key actors in the development of Activity II allowed for the rapid emergence of a program subculture with its own language, norms, technology, economic system, and the other elements of a functional entity in the Teacher Corps program structure.
5. The power and viability of the Student Initiated Activities Model (SIA) which was developed by OJJDP/LEAA and was further refined by the 10 projects in the field.

C. The Activity II Subculture

Analysis of the data revealed that the Activity II Youth Advocacy Program (YAP) subculture, although temporary, made an impact on the Teacher Corps program at the federal level, OJJDP/LEAA perspective on schools, and on the flexibility of the external evaluator. The culture refined the technology of the SIA model, generally used time, expertise, and fiscal resources to benefit youth and schools, developed its own jargon, extended courtesy and attention to newcomers and, for the most part, was productive and functional. The participants perceived that local project goals were met well, and almost two-thirds felt the program had reduced disruptive behavior in the cooperating schools. Areas for further research were delineated, limitations were pin-pointed, and data was collected from which further generalization can be drawn.

D. Summary of Specific Findings

A review of the findings revealed the following specific data:

1. Each federal agency had an internal structure with lack of role parellelism between the two.
2. The School Crime Intervention Program, created by the interagency agreement between OJJDP/LEAA and Teacher Corps, developed, operated, and evaluated 10 programs across the country, each of which reportedly had some impact on the problem of school crime, at relatively low cost, without establishing a new federal agency.

3. OJJDP/LEAA and Teacher Corps, Washington agreed that the Activity II YAP would operate under the supervision of a new field role, an Associate Director to be selected by the Project Director with job functions and power specified at the local project level.

4. Much of the tension surrounding program operation revolved around the role of the LEAA selected external project evaluators and allocation of resources to this evaluation of project impact.

5. Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Program Directors were instructed to keep Activity II "separate." The site of the project could not be the same as Activity I and the staff for Activity II was to be different from Activity I. Later, projects were instructed to articulate Activity I and Activity II.

6. Interviews revealed there was unclarity about the goals of Activity II, or at least that the field staff received mixed messages from the cooperating agencies.

7. Staff personnel in both federal agencies learned each others' vocabulary and style quickly and functioned well. However, it took the field-based staff longer and created misinterpretations of messages from the Washington offices to the local projects.

8. Respondents reported a variety of interpretations concerning the major intervention strategy of the program, Student Initiated Activities (SIA). Definitions ranged from youth participation to youth power in and over school affairs.

9. Ultimately an acceptable definition of SIA was evolved at conferences in November, 1977 and March, 1978, but Teacher Corps funding patterns still did not permit students to receive money for participation in student initiated activities.

10. Common role and outcome definitions emerged during the course of the program. More roles were defined as liaisons among the various groups. Outcome statements reflected all groups accepting crime reduction in schools and testing the SIA model and impact studies as important outcomes of Activity II.

11. Once all groups had engaged in several face-to-face encounters, a common program identity emerged.

12. The transactional style of organizational process characteristic of the administration of Teacher Corps was functional in the development and operation of the interagency agreement and the related field-based Activity II projects.

E. Discussion and Implications

The following are implications of and recommendations which correspond to the above findings:

1. The inclusion of the Commissioner of Education on the Coordinating Council of OJJDP/LEAA would create greater linkages of the agencies. If another interagency arrangement is negotiated, it is also recommended that an Interagency Committee be established including representatives of the following role groups from Teacher Corps: YAP Coordinator, Research Liaison, Education Program Specialists, Fiscal Officer, The Loop Board of Directors, the Associate Directors group, and the Director of Teacher Corps or his designee. From the OJJDP/LEAA and the External Evaluator: the Director of Special Emphasis Projects, the Program Monitor, a Research Specialist, OJJDP/LEAA consultants, and one or more representatives of the External Evaluator should be included. It is suggested that this Interagency Committee meet four times a year to clarify goals, deal with governance issues, and set policy. This should insure parity, parallel roles at the interface, and negotiation as characteristics of the collaborative model which worked in the Activity II School Crime Intervention Program.

2. Using this interagency agreement as a model, replications of this program and others should be encouraged when it can be shown that the previously described conditions and enabling legislation are present.

3. If Activity II is to operate as a semi-autonomous entity within an ongoing YAP project, then the individual responsible (here, the Associate Director), must have clear tasks, reporting structures, resources, peer support systems, channels to federal agencies, and parameters in which to function. The title might be changed to Coordinator and the relationship to the Project Director and other agencies should be

detailed either by group negotiation (in the Interagency Committee) or by federal guidelines. A general selection model and set of role responsibilities could be developed with input from the concerned groups.

4. Sufficient planning time should be allowed to permit field-based staff to understand, and, where necessary, modify the design of the external evaluator. Again, the role responsibilities of the External Evaluator should be negotiated early in the arrangement, e.g., the number of site visits and local responsibility for data collection.

5. If institutionalization of Activity II program elements is to occur, the experience and skills of the Activity I YAP staff should be utilized to accomplish this legitimation. In any case, future YAP projects should incorporate (within the limits of fiscal and legislative constraints) successful elements of Activity II.

6. If another interagency agreement is negotiated, common definitions must be reached at the federal level with input from the field concerning the thrust of the program, i.e., crime reduction or testing the SIA Model, or impact evaluation or all of these.

7. If another interagency agreement is negotiated, Teacher Corps, OJJDP/LEAA personnel, and the evaluator should receive an orientation which will familiarize them with the function, style, and goals of the other agencies.

8. Definition of the terms should have come from both the project and the agency levels so that goal displacement would have been reduced in the field. This would have allowed the identification of non-negotiable items prior to the implementation of Activity II and the external evaluation.

9. Examination of the funding patterns of Teacher Corps is encouraged. If a functional staff development model can be evolved by using some funds to provide direct service to students, such funds should be made available through the Office of Education or through other interagency agreements.

10. If another interagency agreement is negotiated, systematic comprehensive documentation should be built in from the beginning of the activity to document changes and provide feedback to program planners, implementors, and evaluators. Program

cultures drift. Decision makers should be aware of these drifts in an ongoing way.

11. If another interagency agreement is negotiated, opportunity for cross-role training and communication should be frequent. This will speed up the sense of program identity. Some meetings should be structured as informational, others as rituals and rites of solidarity and intensification.

12. Reporting formats, content, and feedback processes should be established jointly by the agencies prior to the implementation of the interagency program. External evaluation should be agreed upon by both parties and the field participants and then contracted jointly.

F. General Conclusion

In conclusion, the "success" of the interagency agreement has been documented. Two federal agencies developed, operated, and evaluated a complex School Crime Intervention Program in ten different sites across the country. Irrespective of their differences, they were able, over a very short period of time, to develop a common vocabulary, share technologies, establish work norms, incorporate newcomers, and take pride in their identification with the Activity II program subculture. The ambition of the program's goals, the reduction of school crime and disruption, improving school climate, testing a Student Initiated Activities Model, and doing an impact study is to be admired. But the time span allocated for the achievement of these ambitious goals was unrealistic according to participants and informed experts.

G. Specific Conclusions

Among the most important conclusions related to facilitation of program design and operation were:

1. Field-based readiness - A readiness to engage in the program on the part of the local project field-based personnel in or associated with the federal agency, as a result of previous experience and communication.
2. Power and authority of chief administrators in the two agencies to respond quickly to crucial issues in the program and negotiate them.

3. The accommodation of different styles of agency operation, negotiation of conflict, and communication at all levels of the organization on the basis of parity between the two agencies due to the use of the transactional style of organizational management.
4. Frequent contact between the key actors.
5. The viability and power of the Student Initiated Activities Model on which the interagency agreement focused.
6. The development and institutionalization of new norms resulting from the subculture of the joint program.

H. Implications for the Future

Conclusions from an administrative perspective are best described in a statement by William Smith, Director of Teacher Corps, who indicated that the Youth Advocacy Projects have been influenced by the interagency agreement with OJJDP/LEAA in the following ways:

a) Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Projects will continue to work with the Student Initiated Activities Model in the next five year cycle.
b) The value of the external evaluation model developed by the Social Action Research Center will be considered in future programs.
c) Teacher Corps programs in 1978 must include goals, objectives, and activities for making a positive impact on school climate, a concept derived from the interagency agreement with OJJDP/LEAA.
d) Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Projects hereafter will be expected to include activities aimed at reducing school crime and disruption and the climate of fear associated with these events.

V. Areas of Further Research

Additional insights into the development of interagency agreements might be generated through the use of the theoretical constructs described above. In order to determine whether agencies should engage in interagency agreements, the criteria

specified in the complementarity of needs framework might be employed. Data generated from this kind of needs assessment might give direction to program decision makers about the potentials for success of a given endeavor. Computer simulation models much like those used to plan the location and cost effectiveness of public utility sites could be programmed to determine the potential success of anticipated interagency agreements.

In the full report, the investigators used some constructs from systems analysis and psychological anthropology to examine other areas of research. For example, a systems analysis approach seemed most comprehensive in looking at programs which required that agencies collaborate as equals to operate field based programs. These constructs permitted comment on the manipulable aspects of the collaborating agencies. Redirecting, correcting or reformulating an organization or a series of programs is at best difficult and often impossible. It is foolhardy to begin making modifications by attempting to change basic organizational attitudes. However, it is possible to introduce disequalibrium in the organization by making changes in four areas of the system, in the structure, function, content and process.

Structure refers to the formal and informal role relationships and superior and subordinate relationships characteristic of any formal organization. Modifying one component in a role set will change the nature of the other role relationships. Function refers to the expected behaviors attendant to the roles in the organization, e.g., the teacher teaches and the pupil learns, the doctor treats and the patient gets well. Specifying new or different expectations for the behavior of persons in a role will require the accommodation of new performance requirements or a new role incumbant. This creates organizational change.

A content change can be made by redefining a goal or making the means as important as the goals of the organization. Attendant changes in structure and function follow. A prime example of goal displacement[1] can often be seen in the mental hospital whose

[1]Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations, (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964) pp. 84-85.

major function is to cure patients. However, mental hospitals are frequently custodial institutions charged with keeping patients from endangering or distrurbing the public. Custodial activities are essential to therapy, but if custodial means become a major focus of the activities, then the therapeutic ends are displaced. Examination revealed that the resource patterns, the personnel and the operation of an agency changed markedly with making means more important than goals.

Finally, a change in organizational communication processes, who talks to whom, who reports to whom, how are resources allocated, can create a profound change in the pattern of organizational operation. By using these four concepts, structure, function, concent and process, further research on interagency agreements can be conducted in a logical and systematic fashion.

The scarcity of interagency agreements among federal agencies like the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Justice limits the availability of evaluation research sites or programs. However, research related to the development of policy statements to guide the formation and administration of such agreements is a fertile area. It might be useful to interview key administrators of such agreements to find out why more such agreements have not been negotiated, how obstacles might be overcome and what advantages and costs are perceived by those who must implement such agreements.

VI. Educational Importance of the Study

If we look at the educational importance of this study, we discover that the study delineated a model which can be replicated by governmental agencies at all levels--national, state, county, and local--to involve education and other disciplines in joint programs achieving more effective use of resources, potentially greater frequency of cooperation, and speedier achievement of goals. Further, the application of the theories and techniques of the anthropologist permit a more comprehensive description of the processes involved in developing interagency agreements among federal agencies, and allow for prediction of consequences based on analysis of the

conditions of readiness for involved agencies. Finally, the constructs of acculturation and diffusion provide useful rubrics with which to view the impact of agencies as cultures in contact.